## A NEW NAME FOR ARGYNNIS LAIS EDWARDS (LEPIDOPTERA, RHOPALOCERA)

## By Cyril Franklin dos Passos ${ }^{1}$ and Lionel Paul Grey ${ }^{2}$

Mr. Nicholas W. Gillham, of New York, has kindly called our attention to the fact that Argynnis lais Edwards, 1883, is a primary homonym of Argynnis lais Scudder, 1875, and has suggested that it would be appropriate to propose a new name for the former insect.

Argynnis lais was published by Scudder in the synonymy of "Brenthis Triclaris (Hübn.) Herr.-Schaeff.," with the statement that ". . . Many years ago I distributed specimens of this butterfly under the MS. name of Arg. Lais."

Subsequent to the publication of these two homonyms the former was transferred to Proclossiana and is now considered a synonym of $P$. eunomia triclaris (Hübner), [1821], while the latter is classified as Speyeria (Speyeria) atlantis lais (Edwards).

Prior to the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology at Copenhagen in 1953, the mere listing of a specific name in the synonymy without an independent description was considered publication thereof, in accordance with Opinion 4 of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (1907; Hemming, 1944). That opinion was incorporated in the Règles by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at Paris in 1948 (Hemming, 1950), but that action was reversed by the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology (Hemming, 1953). Since the latter action is not retroactive, we propose for this insect the name

Speyeria (Speyeria) atlantis helena, new name.
The type of helena is the lectotype of Argynnis lais, a male in the Carnegie Museum.

It is a question, in a case like the present, whether a new name

[^0](helena) for an homonym (lais) should be proposed in the original genus (Argynnis) in which the homonym was described or in the genus (Speyeria [Speyeria]) to which the homonym has been transferred. The Règles are silent on this subject and there are precedents for both methods of procedure.

It would be well, for the sake of uniformity, to amend the Règles so that this problem is covered. Such an amendment should not be retroactive, because that could upset many names. Possibly it should not even be mandatory, but merely in the form of a recommendation.
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